



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,399	04/22/2005	Akihiro Miyashita	38155	9124
52054	7590	12/11/2008	EXAMINER	
PEARNE & GORDON LLP			HSU, AMY R	
1801 EAST 9TH STREET				
SUITE 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			2622	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/11/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patdocket@pearne.com  
dchervenak@pearne.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/532,399	MIYASHITA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	AMY HSU	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,6,7,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-3,6,7,9 and 10 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/9/2008 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6, and 7, 9-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The amendments introduce new limitations to the claims and therefore necessitate an update search and new grounds of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirakawa (US 2003/0117501) in view of Kawasaki et al. (US 7173665).

Regarding Claim 1, Shirakawa teaches a digital camera, comprising: a first camera provided on a first surface of a casing member (*Fig. 9 reference number 10b, "front camera"*); a first liquid crystal display part provided on the first surface of the casing member (*Fig. 9 reference number 62*); a second camera provided on a second surface in the back side of the first surface of the casing member (*Fig. 9 reference number 10a*); and a control unit that controls photographing operations of the first camera and the second camera (*Fig. 8 reference number 101, 102 "controller"*); wherein the first liquid crystal display part has a first display area and a second display area, the first display area displays all or a part of images caught by the first camera, and the second display area displays all or a part of images caught by the second camera (*Paragraph 37 and Fig. 3 show the display can have a first and second area, in this case superimposed, where each area displays an image from the first and second camera respectively*). However, Shirakawa does not teach the second surface in the back side of the first surface of the casing member has a second LCD, with third and fourth display substantially identical to the first and second display areas of the first LCD. One of ordinary skill in the art recognizes it is well known that digital cameras, especially in the form of cell phones, commonly have two displays, on opposite sides of the housing. Kawasaki teaches a camera with a display on opposing sides of the device, where the displays both display the image captured, which are substantially identical images as seen in Figs. 4B and C and Col 11 Lines 58-63. Thus, the concept

Art Unit: 2622

of displaying identical images on two separate displays on opposite sides of an image pickup device is well known.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Shirakawa which displays images from two cameras on one display, by adding another display showing the same thing. This would have been obvious because cameras with two displays are commonly used with two people, one on each side of the device. One display for each person on opposite sides of the device would allow for each person to view the same output image consisting of images of both people involved on either side of the device.

Regarding Claim 2, Shirakawa teaches the digital camera according to claim 1, further comprising a camera selecting unit that selects a camera for photographing, wherein both the first camera and the second camera are selected by the camera selecting unit to photograph images by both the first camera and the second camera (*paragraph 9 teaches the device captures a plurality of images*). Shirakawa does not specifically teach when exactly the plurality of images is captured. However paragraph 30 teaches the two cameras are each separate fully functional cameras. It is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that each camera could independently capture images either at the same time, as if it were two separate devices, or be selected for one or the other camera to capture images. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Shirakawa by allowing the two cameras to photograph at the same time because each camera is

facing an opposite direction and the images are superimposed so it would be useful for the user to see the images about to be captured and then press the capture button to capture exactly what is seen on the screen, which would be a capture from each camera at the same time.

Regarding Claim 3, Shirakawa teaches the digital camera according to claim 1, further comprising an image synthesizing unit that synthesizes the images photographed by the first camera and the second camera to photograph the synthesized image obtained by synthesizing the images photographed by the first camera and the second camera (*Fig. 8 reference number 103, image processor, synthesizes the image photographed by the first and second camera*).

Regarding Claim 6, Shirakawa teaches the digital camera according to claim 1, further comprising an image storing unit (*Fig. 8 reference number 6*) for storing a moving image (*paragraph 2 "moving images"*) photographed by the first camera or the second camera.

Regarding Claim 7, Shirakawa teaches a portable telephone equipped with a digital camera on which the digital camera according to any one of claims 1 to 3 and 6 is mounted (*Fig. 9*).

Regarding Claim 9, as a continuation of the paragraph regarding Claim 1, it would have been obvious to show exactly the same image displayed by Shirakawa with images from both cameras on one display on the opposite side. Therefore both parts of the Shirakawa display should be displayed on the opposite side, also having both images from both cameras, where the two images from the two cameras are both displayed on each of the two displays. As addressed with claim 1, this would have been an obvious modification of the device taught by Shirakawa because it allows for both users to see the same display for the purpose of seeing a preview of the frame before image capturing and also for both sides to view the same captured images, as is the case with Kawasaki and is a well known concept in the art.

Regarding Claim 10, Shirakawa teaches the digital camera according to claim 1, wherein the images caught by the first camera and the images caught by the second camera are simultaneously displayed in both the first liquid crystal display part and the second liquid crystal display part. Paragraph 44 teaches images from both cameras are superimposed and displayed on the LCD. Fig. 3 shows an example of images from both cameras superimposed, which also shows they are simultaneously displayed in two distinct parts of the LCD.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMY HSU whose telephone number is (571)270-3012. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on 571-272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Amy Hsu  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2622

ARH 11/25/08

/Lin Ye/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622